(b) was there not a report submitted by the District Judge on 26th Mithunam 1103 to the Chief Court on the above review petition ;

(c) have the Government noted any difference of tones in the final report, dated 17th Kumbham 1102 and in the report on the review petition dated 26th Mithunam 1103 ; if so, have the Government shown any consideration to the petitioner Mr. Ravunni Menon on that basis ;

(d) what was the order of the Chief Court on the review petition ?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) Government do not note any difference in the tone of the two reports.

(d) The petition was dismissed.

Review before the Diwan.

194. Mr. K. J. Antony.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) has Mr. Ravunni Menon preferred a review before the Diwan on 1st Kumbham 1104 ;

(b) has any order been passed on that review petition ; and if so, what and when ?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—(a) Yes.

(b) The petition was recorded on 28th Kumbham 1104.

Mr. K. J. Antony.—May I know, with regard to question (b), whether any final orders have been passed ?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—The order is that the petition has been recorded.

Mr. K. J. Antony.—Is it the final order ?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Yes.

Mr. K. J. Antony.—Am I to take it that the order has been passed after taking into consideration his review petition also ?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Yes.

Distinction between the charges of Messrs. Ravunni Menon, Muthuswami Ayyar and Venkiteswara Ayyar.

195. Mr. K. J. Antony.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) was there any distinction between the charges against Messrs. Ravunni Menon, Venkiteswara Ayyar, who was for some time the Head clerk of the Chittur Munsiff's Court, and C. K. Muthuswami Ayyar, the late Head clerk of the Deputy Inspector of Schools; if so, what ;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(b) was there any loss of money to the Government in the cases of Messrs. Ravunni Menon, Venkiteswara Ayyar and Muthuswami Ayyar, respectively ;

(c) did not Messrs. Venkiteswara Ayyar and Muthuswami Ayyar abscond from the State immediately after the acts of misappropriation were detected against them ;

(d) what was the special reason to show an act of special mercy to Mr. Venkiteswara Ayyar on his petition; to whom was the petition presented ;

(e) was there any special reason to grant a compassionate allowance in the case of Mr. Muthuswami Ayyar; if so, what was that ;

(f) was there any relative of Muthuswami Ayyar in the Huzur Secretariat when this compassionate allowance was granted to him ; if so, what was the name and office of such relative ;

(g) why was not the same attitude taken with regard to the case of Mr. Ravunni Menon also ?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—(a) The charge against Ravunni Menon was one of temporary misappropriation of various amounts extending over a period of few months and that against C. R. Venkiteswara Ayyar one of temporary misappropriation of two items amounting to Rs. 21—10—0. The charges against Muthuswami Ayyar were irregularity in office work, suspected misconduct and misappropriation of money.

(b) There was no loss of money in any of the 3 cases.

(c) No.

(d) The petition was presented to the Diwan. There was no special reason.

(e) Yes. His helpless condition and long service under the Government.

(f) Not known.

(g) Government did not think that any consideration was required in this case.

Misconduct of a Head clerk of the District Court.

196. Mr. K. J. Antony.— Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) what is the office order of the District Munsiff of Ernakulam, dated 25th Karkadagam 1095, regarding the delay in remitting money into the treasury by the then Head clerk, Mr. P. N. Subramania Pillai ;

(b) has the District Munsiff made any report regarding this misconduct of the Head clerk to the District Court; if so, what was that and when ;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly